

AF/2152
JHW

Serial No.: 09/160,424
Docket No.: 1215



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Inventors : Schneebeli *et al.*
Serial No. : 09/160,424
Filing Date : September 25, 1998
Title : VIRTUAL CONTENT PUBLISHING SYSTEM AND
METHOD

Group/Art Unit : 2152

Examiner : Willett, Stephan

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patent
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated July 11, 2005, submitted herewith is a revised Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 1.192 in support of the Notice of Appeal filed on April 2, 2004 and received in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on April 5, 2004. Applicant notes that the original Appeal Brief was filed on June 7, 2004 and received in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on June 9, 2004, prior to the effective date of 37 C.F.R. §41.37. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the revised Appeal Brief must comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.192, which was confirmed during a telephone conference with the Examiner on August 11, 2005.

Acknowledgment of receipt is respectfully requested.

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on:

Date: August 11, 2005

Signature: Sonna Oakley

Printed Name Sonna Oakley

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-4409.

Serial No.: 09/160,424

Docket No.: 1215

Respectfully submitted,

By: Judith L. Carlson

Judith L. Carlson, Reg. No. 41,904

STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP

1201 Walnut Street, Suite 2900

P.O. Box 419251

Kansas City, MO 64141-6251

Telephone: (816) 842-8600

Facsimile: (816) 691-3495



Serial No.: 09/160,424

Docket No.: 1215

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

REVISED APPEAL BRIEF

Inventors : Schneebeli *et al.*
Serial No. : 09/160,424
Filing Date : September 25, 1998
Title : VIRTUAL CONTENT PUBLISHING SYSTEM AND
METHOD

Group/Art Unit : 2152
Examiner : Willett, Stephan

Docket No. : 1215

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patent
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.192, Applicant submits this revised Appeal Brief in support of the Notice of Appeal filed on April 2, 2004 and received in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on April 5, 2004. This revised Appeal Brief will replace the original Reply Brief filed on June 7, 2004 and received in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on June 9, 2004.

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patent, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on:

Date:

August 11, 2005.

Signature:

Printed Name:

Sonna Oakley
Sonna Oakley

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-4409.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in the present appeal is the assignee, Sprint Communications Company, L.P. The assignment was recorded at Reel 9885, Frame 0983 of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office records.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54 are pending in the application. Claims 23, 32, 42, and 47 have been canceled. Claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54 stand finally rejected, as follows: claims 1, 14, 30, 37, 41, 46 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,026,371 to Beck *et al.* ("Beck") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,111 to Inohara *et al.* ("Inohara"); claims 1, 7, 13-16, 25, 33-34, 38, 41, 46 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,867,677 to Butman *et al.* ("Butman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,125, 388 to Reisman ("Reisman"); and claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,199,082 to Ferrel *et al.* ("Ferrel") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,584 to Chang *et al.* ("Chang"). The present appeal is directed to claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54, which are reproduced in Appendix A attached hereto.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection dated January 28, 2004.

V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The present invention is directed to a system and method for generating, editing and/or testing staging content on a staging server (*e.g.*, the server within staging area 16 of FIG. 1), and automatically transferring the staging content from the staging server to multiple production servers (*e.g.*, the servers within production areas 14A and 14B of FIG. 1) that reside on a computer network (*e.g.*, the Internet). Importantly, after the staging content has been transferred to the production servers, the transferred staging content is published on each of the production servers at substantially the same time in response to a publish command received on the staging server. Each production server is then able to provide the published staging content to content users of the computer network (*e.g.*, users browsing the Internet) in response to requests routed to the production servers from the content users. Advantageously, all of the content users may be assured of receiving the same content (*i.e.*, the published staging content) regardless of which of the production servers processes their particular requests. An embodiment of this content publication method is described on page 11, line 22 to page 14, line 21 of the application with reference to the flow chart of FIG. 5. In particular, it should be noted that the staging content is transferred from the staging server to the production servers (in step 268) and then subsequently published on the production servers at substantially the same time (in step 272).

Preferably, access to the staging server is restricted to two access levels. Specifically, a first user associated with a first access level is allowed to control the generation, editing and/or testing of staging content on the staging server. A second user associated with a second access

level is allowed to control the transfer of the staging content from the staging server to the production servers and/or the publication of the transferred staging content on each of the production servers at substantially the same time. This security feature ensures that only those individuals with the proper authorization can access the staging server to perform these tasks. An embodiment that utilizes this security feature is described on page 10, lines 3-27 of the application.

More preferably, the staging content on the production servers may be replaced with the production content that was on the production servers prior to transfer and publication (the "prior production content") in response to a rollback command received on the staging server. The replacement of the staging content with the prior production content provides for a rollback to the previous version of the content if desired, such as if a problem is encountered with a particular production server during publication. An embodiment that utilizes this rollback feature is described on page 13, line 29 to page 14, line 7 and page 15, lines 6-16 of the application.

VI. ISSUES

The issues on appeal are as follows:

- A. Whether claims 1, 14, 30, 37, 41, 46 and 51 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Beck in view of Inohara.
- B. Whether claims 1, 7, 13-16, 25, 33-34, 38, 41, 46 and 52 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Butman in view of Reisman.
- C. Whether claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Ferrel in view of Chang.

VII. GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS

With respect to the rejection stated in Issue A, claims 1, 14 and 51 stand or fall together; claims 30 and 37 stand or fall together; and claims 41 and 46 stand or fall together. As discussed in Section VIII.A below, these three different groups of claims are separately patentable.

With respect to the rejection stated in Issue B, claims 1, 7, 13-16, 25 and 52 stand or fall together; claims 33, 34 and 38 stand or fall together; and claims 41 and 46 stand or fall together. As discussed in Section VIII.B below, these three different groups of claims are separately patentable.

With respect to the rejection stated in Issue C, claims 1-22, 24-29 and 51-54 stand or fall together; claims 30, 31 and 33-40 stand or fall together; and claims 41, 43-46 and 48-50 stand or fall together. As discussed in Section VIII.C below, these three different groups of claims are separately patentable.

VIII. ARGUMENT

A. Applicant's Claims are not Obvious Over Beck in View of Inohara

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 14, 30, 37, 41, 46 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Beck (attached hereto as Appendix B) in view of Inohara (attached hereto as Appendix C). Beck discloses a method and system for permitting businesses and organizations to preview their customized advertisements for Web-based directory listings (such as Online Yellow Page directories) on a staging database before exportation to a production database. The method comprises creating (or revising) an advertisement using widely available HTML tools, importing the resulting HTML source and associated multi-media files into a staging database, and previewing the advertisement on the staging database as if the

advertisement were running on the production database. Inohara merely discloses a method and system for managing distributed data in which a plurality of computers interconnected by a network operate to distribute, share and exchange data over the World Wide Web.

Applicant respectfully submits that a prima facie case of obviousness for rejecting these claims has not been established in that the cited references do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest the claimed invention. See In re Bell, 26 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)(quoting In re Rinehart, 189 U.S.P.Q. 143,147 (C.C.P.A. 1976)) (finding that the Patent and Trademark Office's burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness is not met unless "the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art.").

First, Beck and Inohara do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest the transfer of staging content from a staging server to first and second (or a plurality of) production servers for publication at substantially the same time, as required by claims 1, 14, 30, 37 and 41, 46 and 51.

In the Office Action dated January 28, 2004, the Examiner argues that although Beck does not explicitly teach "transferring content at the same time to more than one production server,"

Inohara provides this missing limitation. As initial matter, it should be noted that the claimed limitation is not the transfer of staging content from a staging server to a plurality of production servers at substantially the same time. Rather, the claims require the transfer of staging content from a staging server to a plurality of production servers for publication at substantially the same time. Clearly, Beck does not disclose this limitation in that it merely discloses the exportation of an advertisement from a staging database to a single production database. Inohara also does not disclose this limitation. The portions of Inohara cited by the Examiner merely disclose the transfer of requests for URL content from a host server to other servers and/or the receipt at the

host server of URL messages from other servers (wherein each of the URL messages is a list of specific URL contents that have been added to one of the other servers). Nowhere does Inohara disclose or suggest the transfer of any type of information (whether it be requests for URL content or URL messages) to a plurality of servers for publication at substantially the same time. Thus, claims 1, 14, 30, 37 and 41, 46 and 51 are clearly distinguishable from Beck and Inohara.

In addition, Beck and Inohara do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest limiting access to a staging server, wherein a first user associated with a first access level is allowed to control generation of staging content, and wherein a second user associated with a second access level is allowed to control the transfer of staging content from a staging server to multiple production servers, as required by claims 30 and 37. Rather, Beck discloses that an advertisement can be edited by a variety of sources, such as a business, a publisher, or anyone providing the Web-based directory listing. Also, Beck does not disclose any details as to who controls the exportation of the advertisement to the production database or how the exportation is accomplished. Inohara also does not disclose this limitation in that it does not teach a staging server or the transfer of staging content from a staging server to multiple production servers. Thus, claims 30 and 37 are even further distinguishable from Beck and Inohara.

Furthermore, Beck and Inohara do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest replacing the staging content transferred to the plurality of production servers with prior production content for publication at substantially the same time in response to a rollback command, as required by claims 41 and 46. In fact, neither of these references teach any type of command (whether it be a "rollback command" or otherwise) that performs the function required by claims 41 and 46, namely, replacing staging content transferred to a plurality of production

servers with prior production content for publication at substantially the same time. Thus, claims 41 and 46 are even further distinguishable from Beck and Inohara.

Because the Examiner has failed to meet his burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness, claims 1, 14, 30, 37, 41, 46 and 51 should be allowed.

B. Applicant's Claims are not Obvious Over Butman in View of Reisman

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1, 7, 13-16, 25, 33-34, 38, 41, 46 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butman (attached hereto as Appendix D) in view of Reisman (attached hereto as Appendix E). Butman discloses a system that includes a domain communications server connected over the Internet to a number of client side communications servers (which are located at the sites of member corporate clients). Information may be disseminated from any one of the client side communications servers to any or all of the other client side communications servers through the domain communications server. This arrangement creates an intelligent extranet that links a community of member corporate clients together over the Internet via the domain communications server. As a result, each member corporate client can communicate with other member corporate clients as though the others were a part of its own internal network or intranet. Reisman merely discloses an information transport component that can be used with a variety of electronic information products (e.g., electronic magazines) to automate the mass distribution of updates (e.g., current issues) to a wide user base.

Applicant respectfully submits that a prima facie case of obviousness for rejecting these claims has not been established in that the cited references do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest the claimed invention. See In re Bell, 26 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)(quoting In re Rinehart, 189 U.S.P.Q. 143,147 (C.C.P.A. 1976)) (finding that the Patent and Trademark Office's burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness is not met

unless "the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art.").

First, Butman and Reisman do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest the transfer of staging content from a staging server to first and second (or a plurality of) production servers for publication at substantially the same time, as required by claims 1, 7, 13-16, 25, 33-34, 38, 41, 46 and 52. In the Office Action dated January 28, 2004, the Examiner argues that Butman teaches the claimed invention "except for explicitly teaching a scheduling system," and that Reisman provides this missing limitation. This argument misses the mark. In Butman, a client side communications server is able to send information to other client side communications servers by communicating directly with an intermediate domain communications server. Neither the domain communications server nor the client side communications servers are used as staging servers. In addition, the information sent between the client side communications servers through the domain communications server is not published at substantially the same time. The Reisman reference merely discloses an information transport component that can be used to automate the mass distribution of updates to a wide user base. It does not disclose a staging server or the transfer of information to multiple production servers for publication at substantially the same time. Thus, claims 1, 7, 13-16, 25, 33-34, 38, 41, 46 and 52 are clearly distinguishable from Butman and Reisman.

In addition, Butman and Reisman do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest limiting access to a staging server, wherein a first user associated with a first access level is allowed to control generation of staging content, and wherein a second user associated with a second access level is allowed to control the transfer of staging content from a staging server to multiple production servers, as required by claims 33, 34 and 38. Simply stated, neither Butman

nor Reisman disclose this limitation because they do not teach a staging server or the transfer of staging content from a staging server to multiple production servers. Thus, claims 33, 34 and 38 are even further distinguishable from Butman and Reisman.

Furthermore, Butman and Reisman do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest replacing the staging content transferred to the plurality of production servers with prior production content for publication at substantially the same time in response to a rollback command, as required by claims 41 and 46. In fact, neither of these references teach any type of command (whether it be a "rollback command" or otherwise) that performs the function required by claims 41 and 46, namely, replacing staging content transferred to a plurality of production servers with prior production content for publication at substantially the same time. Thus, claims 41 and 46 are even further distinguishable from Butman and Reisman.

Because the Examiner has failed to meet his burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness, claims 1, 7, 13-16, 25, 33-34, 38, 41, 46 and 52 should be allowed.

C. Applicant's Claims are not Obvious Over Ferrel in View of Chang

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ferrel (attached hereto as Appendix F) in view of Chang (attached hereto as Appendix G). Ferrel discloses a multimedia publishing system that can be used to publish on-line newspapers, magazines and the like. In this system, two different components of a publication (namely, the layout of the publication and the content of the publication) are uploaded and stored separately on a server located at a public distribution point. The upload of the layout component of the publication to the public distribution point is performed on a limited basis (e.g., only upon initial creation of the publication) due to the fact that a publication's layout typically remains constant. However, because the content typically

changes, the content component of the publication is uploaded to the public distribution point on a regular basis. In operation, when an end user initially downloads the publication, both the content and the layout components of the publication are transmitted to the end user's computer. Subsequent downloads, however, transmit only the content component of the publication to the end user's computer because the layout component has been cached on the end user's computer after the initial download. Ferrel discloses that this publication scheme allows for the download of a publication in bandwidth limited environments due to the fact that the layout component of the publication (which is typically bandwidth intensive) does not need to be transmitted to the end user after the initial download. Chang merely discloses a system and method that allows an end user to schedule the download of data such as web pages, databases or software, over a computer network such as the Internet.

Applicant respectfully submits that a prima facie case of obviousness for rejecting these claims has not been established in that the cited references do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest the claimed invention. See In re Bell, 26 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993)(quoting In re Rinehart, 189 U.S.P.Q. 143,147 (C.C.P.A. 1976)) (finding that the Patent and Trademark Office's burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness is not met unless "the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art.").

First, Ferrel and Chang do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest the transfer of staging content from a staging server to first and second (or a plurality of) production servers for publication at substantially the same time, as required by claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54. In the Office Action dated January 28, 2004, the Examiner argues that Ferrel teaches the claimed invention "except for explicitly teaching a scheduling system," and that Chang provides

this missing limitation. Yet again, this argument misses the mark. Ferrel discloses a multimedia publishing system that includes a server located at a public distribution point that stores the layout and content components of a publication. Importantly, the layout and content components of the publication are transferred to a single public distribution point (i.e., a production server), at which point the components are separately available to end users surfing the Internet. The layout and content components of the publication are not, however, transferred to a plurality of production servers, let alone for publication at substantially the same time. As to the Chang reference, it merely discloses a system that allows an end user to schedule the download of data over the Internet. It does not disclose the transfer of information to multiple production servers for publication at substantially the same time. Thus, claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54 are clearly distinguishable from Ferrel and Chang.

In addition, Ferrel and Chang do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest limiting access to a staging server, wherein a first user associated with a first access level is allowed to control generation of staging content, and wherein a second user associated with a second access level is allowed to control the transfer of staging content from a staging server to multiple production servers, as required by claims 30, 31 and 33-40. Furthermore, Ferrel and Chang do not alone or in combination disclose or suggest replacing the staging content transferred to the plurality of production servers with prior production content for publication at substantially the same time in response to a rollback command, as required by claims 41, 43-46 and 48-50. Thus, these claims are even further distinguishable from Ferrel and Chang.

Because the Examiner has failed to meet his burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness, claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54 should be allowed.

IX. APPENDICES

Attached hereto are the following Appendices:

Appendix A – Claims on Appeal

Appendix B – U.S. Patent No. 6,026,371 to Beck *et al.*

Appendix C – U.S. Patent No. 6,182,111 to Inohara *et al.*

Appendix D – U.S. Patent No. 5,867,667 to Butman *et al.*

Appendix E – U.S. Patent No. 6,125,388 to Reisman

Appendix F – U.S. Patent No. 6,199,082 to Ferrel *et al.*

Appendix G – U.S. Patent No. 6,134,584 to Chang *et al.*

X. SUMMARY

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54 are patentable over the cited references and should be allowed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's rejections and allow claims 1-22, 24-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-54.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Judith L. Carlson

Judith L. Carlson, Reg. No. 41,904
STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP
1201 Walnut Street, Suite 2800
P.O. Box 419251
Kansas City, MO 64141-6251
Telephone: (816) 842-8600
Facsimile: (816) 691-3495



APPENDIX A

Claims on Appeal

1. A system for publishing network content, the system comprising:
 - (a) first and second production servers wherein each production server provides production content to content users of a computer network in response to requests routed to the production server from the content users;
 - (b) a staging server operatively connected to each of the first and second production servers, wherein staging content is generated, edited and/or tested by an administrator on the staging server and wherein the staging content is automatically transferred from the staging server to the first and second production servers for publication on the first and second production servers at substantially the same time in response to a publish command received on the staging server, wherein the transferred staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content; and
 - (c) wherein the transferred staging content replaces the production content on the production server such that the transferred staging content becomes subsequent production content accessible by the content users of the computer network, and wherein access to the staging server is limited such that the staging content is not accessible by the content users prior to the transfer to the production server.
2. The system of Claim 1 further comprising a file server for storing the staging content.

3. The system of Claim 1 further comprising a firewall operable to limit access to the staging server.
4. The system of Claim 3 wherein the staging server comprises a segmented server providing processing for a plurality of users.
5. The system of Claim 3 wherein:
a same address is associated with the first production server and the staging server; and
requests associated with the same address are routed to the staging server in response to access through the firewall.
6. The system of Claim 1 wherein the staging server is operable to generate requests for additional content from the network.
7. The system of Claim 1 wherein the staging server is operable to schedule said transfer of the staging content.
8. The system of Claim 7 wherein the staging server is operable to cancel said scheduled transfer.

9. The system of Claim 1 wherein the staging server is operable to replace the production content with prior production content, the prior production content comprising production content previously transferred to the first production server.
10. The system of Claim 1 wherein the staging server is operable to prevent alteration of the staging content on the staging server.
11. The system of Claim 1 wherein the staging server is operable to provide information selected from the group consisting of: log files, status information and combinations thereof.
12. The system of Claim 1 wherein the staging server is operable to provide user selections for at least two actions selected from the group consisting of:
 - generating requests for additional content from the network;
 - scheduling said transfer of the staging content;
 - canceling said scheduled transfer;
 - replacing the production content with prior production content and controlling saving of the production content;
 - preventing alteration of the staging content on the staging server, and
 - providing information selected from the group consisting of: log files, status information and combinations thereof.
13. The system of Claim 1 wherein the first production server is geographically remote from the second production server.

14. A method for publishing content on a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing a staging server wherein staging content is generated, edited and/or tested by an administrator on the staging server;

(b) limiting access to the staging server such that the staging content is not accessible by content users of the computer network;

(c) receiving a publish command on the staging server;

(d) automatically transferring the staging content from the staging server to first and second production servers for publication on the first and second production servers at substantially the same time in response to step (c), wherein the transferred staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content;

(e) replacing production content on the first and second production servers with the transferred staging content such that the transferred staging content becomes subsequent production content; and

(f) providing the subsequent production content to the content users of the computer network in response to requests routed to either of the first and second production servers from the content users.

15. The method of Claim 14 further comprising:

(g) storing the staging content on a file server.

16. The method of Claim 15 wherein step (g) comprises storing the staging content prior to performing step (d).

17. The method of Claim 14 further comprising:
 - (g) verifying a user for access to the staging server.
18. The method of Claim 17 further comprising:
 - (h) segmenting step (a) for a plurality of administrators.
19. The method of Claim 17:

wherein a same address is associated with the staging server and the first production server;

further comprising: (h) routing requests to the staging server in response to step (g).
20. The method of Claim 17 wherein step (g) comprises verifying access by the user as one of at least two access levels.
21. The method of Claim 20 further comprising step (g) of limiting control of step (c) to a first of the at least two access levels.
22. The method of Claim 20 further comprising step (g) of limiting control of step (a) to the administrator.
24. The method of Claim 23 wherein step (g) comprises generating requests for additional content from the computer network from the staging server.

25. The method of Claim 14 further comprising step (g) of scheduling step (d) from the staging server.
26. The method of Claim 25 wherein step (g) comprises canceling step (d).
27. The method of Claim 14 further comprising:
- (g) receiving a replace content command; and
 - (h) replacing the production content on the first and second production servers with prior production content in response to step (g), the prior production content comprising content previously on the first and second production servers.
28. The method of Claim 14 further comprising step (g) of providing information selected from the group consisting of: log files, status information and combinations thereof in the staging server.
29. The method of Claim 14 further comprising providing user selections for at least two actions selected from the group consisting of:
- testing the interaction of the staging content with the computer network from the staging server;
 - scheduling step (d);
 - canceling said scheduled transfer;

replacing the production content on the first and second production servers with prior production content, the prior production content comprising production content previously on the first and second production servers;

preventing alteration of the staging content on the staging server by a content user; and

providing information selected from the group consisting of: log files, status information and combinations thereof.

30. A method for publishing content on a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

- (a) providing a staging server on the computer network;
- (b) limiting access to the staging server such that the server is not accessible by content users of the computer network, the access comprising at least first and second access levels;
- (c) generating staging content on the staging server;
- (d) restricting step (c) in response to a command associated with the first access level;
- (e) receiving a publish command on the staging server;
- (f) automatically transferring the generated staging content from the staging server to first and second production servers for publication on the first and second production servers at substantially the same time in response to step (e), wherein the transferred staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content; and
- (g) restricting step (f) in response to a command associated with the second access level.

31. The method of Claim 30 wherein step (c) comprises editing the staging content.

33. The method of Claim 30 further comprising:

- (h) replacing production content on the first and second production servers with the transferred staging content of step (f); and
- (i) reversing step (h).

34. The method of Claim 30 wherein step (f) comprises replacing the transferred staging content of step (f) on the first and second production servers with the production content.

35. The method of Claim 30 wherein:
the staging server includes segmented software; and
step (c) comprises generating staging content for each of a plurality of administrators, each administrator associated with a segment of the segmented software.

36. The method of Claim 30 further comprising providing user selections for at least two actions selected from the group consisting of:
testing the interaction of the staging content with the computer network from the staging server;
scheduling a transfer of the staging content to the first production server and the second production server;
canceling said scheduled transfer;
transferring the staging content to the first production server and the second production server in response to a publish command;
replacing production content on the first production server with prior production content, the prior production content comprising content previously on the first production server and the second production server;
preventing alteration of the staging content on the staging server by a user associated with a second of the at least two access levels; and

providing information selected from the group consisting of: log files, status information and combinations thereof.

37. A system for publishing content on a computer network, the system comprising:

a staging server and associated software comprising a staging area on the computer network, the staging area operable to allow generation, editing and/or testing by an administrator of staging content and transfer of the staging content from the staging area to a plurality of production areas for publication on the production areas at substantially the same time, wherein the transferred staging content published on each of the production areas is the same staging content;

a firewall operable to limit access to the staging area to at least two access levels such that the staging area is not accessible by content users of the computer network, the firewall operatively connected to the staging server; and

wherein a first user associated with a first of the at least two access levels is allowed to control generation, editing and/or testing of the staging content, and wherein a second user associated with a second of the at least two access levels is allowed to control transfer of the staging content from the staging area to the production areas.

38. The system of Claim 37 further comprising a production server associated with production content; and

wherein the production content is replaced with the staging content associated with the staging area and the replacement is reversed at a later time.

39. The system of Claim 37 wherein the software comprises segmented software; and the each segment of the segmented software is associated with one of a plurality of user groups.

40. The system of Claim 37 further comprising a user interface associated with selections for at least two actions selected from the group consisting of:

testing the interaction of the staging content with the computer network from the staging area;

scheduling a transfer of the staging content to a first production server and a second production server;

canceling said scheduled transfer;

transferring the content to the first production server and the second production server in response to a publish command;

replacing production content on the first production server and the second production server with prior production content, the prior production content comprising content previously on the first production server and the second production server;

providing information selected from the group consisting of: log files, status information and combinations thereof.

41. A method for publishing content on a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing a staging server and a plurality of production servers on the computer network, the staging server associated with staging content and each of the production servers associated with production content, wherein the staging content is not accessible on the staging server by content users of the computer network;

(b) replacing the production content on each of the production servers with the staging content for publication on the production servers at substantially the same time in response to a publish command associated with the staging server, wherein the staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content, whereby the staging content becomes accessible on the production servers by the content users of the computer network; and

(c) replacing the staging content on each of the production servers with the production content for publication on the production servers at substantially the same time in response to a rollback command associated with the staging server, wherein the production content published on each of the production servers is the same production content, whereby the production content is accessible on the production servers by the content users of the computer network.

43. The method of Claim 41 further comprising:

- (d) limiting access to the staging server to at least two access levels;
- (e) generating the staging content on the staging server; and
- (f) restricting step (e) in response to a command associated with one of the at least

two access levels.

44. The method of Claim 41 wherein:

the staging server includes segmented software; and

further comprising (d) generating staging content for each of a plurality of administrators, each administrator associated with a segment of the segmented software.

45. The method of Claim 41 further comprising providing user selections associated with at least two actions selected from the group consisting of:

testing an interaction of the staging content with the computer network from the staging server;

scheduling a transfer of the staging content to a first production server;

canceling said scheduled transfer;

transferring the staging content to the first production server and the second production server in response to a publish command;

preventing alteration of the staging content by a user associated with a first access level;

and

providing information selected from the group consisting of: log files, status information and combinations thereof.

46. A system for publishing content on a computer network, the system comprising:

a staging server associated with the computer network and with staging content, wherein access to the staging server is limited such that the staging content is not accessible by content users of the computer network;

a plurality of production servers wherein each production server is associated with the computer network and with production content that is accessible by the content users of the computer network;

a staging server user interface that allows a user to select a publish command associated with replacement of the production content on each of the production servers with the staging content for publication on each of the production servers at substantially the same time, wherein the staging content published on each of the production servers is the same staging content; and

wherein the staging server user interface also allows the user to select a rollback command associated with replacement of the staging content on each of the production servers with the production content for publication at substantially the same time.

48. The system of Claim 46 further comprising a firewall for limiting access to the staging server to at least two access levels; and

wherein the staging server is operable to generate the staging content in response to input associated with the staging server user interface and is operable to restrict the generation in response to a command associated with one of the at least two access levels.

49. The system of Claim 46 wherein:

the staging server includes segmented software; and

the staging server is operable to generate the staging content for each of a plurality of users, each user associated with a segment of the segmented software.

50. The system of Claim 46 wherein the staging server user interface is associated with user selections for at least two actions selected from the group consisting of:

testing an interaction of the staging content with the computer network from the staging server;

scheduling a replacement of the production content with the staging content;

canceling said scheduled replacement;

replacing the production content on the plurality of production servers with the staging content in response to the publish command;

preventing alteration of the staging content by a user associated with a first access level;

and

providing information selected from the group consisting of: log files, status information and combinations thereof.

51. A method for publishing content on a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) generating, editing and/or testing staging content by an administrator on a staging server, wherein access to the staging server is limited such that the staging content is not accessible on the staging server by content users of the computer network;

(b) replicating the staging content to at least first and second temporary directories;

(c) transferring the staging content from the staging server to first and second production servers associated with the first and second temporary directories, respectively, for publication on the first and second production servers at substantially the same time, wherein the transferred staging content published on the production servers is the same staging content; and

(d) providing the transferred staging content to the content users of the computer network in response to requests routed to either of the first and second production servers from the content users.

52. The method of Claim 51 further comprising step (e) of commanding publication, wherein steps (b) and (c) are responsive to step (e).

53. The method of Claim 51 further comprising step (e) of verifying step (b).

54. The method of Claim 53 wherein step (c) is responsive to step (e).

Serial No.: 09/160,424

Docket No.: 1215

APPENDIX B

U.S. Patent No. 6,026,371 to Beck *et al.*